UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/903,046	07/11/2001	William M. Dovin	END920010022US1 (14549)	9408

7590 06/03/2005	EXAMINER
Steven Fischman, Esq.	BASEHOAR, ADAM L
Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, NY 11530

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
		09/903,046	DOVIN ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit
		Adam L Basehoar	2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 March 2005*.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-4, 7-15, 17-25, 28-35, 37-43, 45-51, and 53-58* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-4,7-15,17-25,28-35,37-43,45-51 and 53-58* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: The Amendment filed 03/17/05 to the

original Application filed on 07/11/01.

2.   Claims 5-6, 16, 26-27, 36, 44, and 52 have been cancelled as necessitated by

Amendment.

3.   The rejection of Claims 1-2, 7-9, 11-13, 17-19, 21-23, 28-30, 32, and 57 remain under 35

U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yahoo Screen Pages, 10/05/1999, pp. 1-5,

http://web.archive.org/web/19991005031700/http://dir.yahoo.com/Arts/Artists/Masters/Directori

es/. (Hereafter referenced as Yahoo).

4.   The rejection of Claims 33-34, 37-42, 45-50, 53-56, and 58 remain under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over Yahoo Screen Pages, 10/05/1999, pp. 1-5,

http://web.archive.org/web/19991005031700/http://dir.yahoo.com/Arts/Artists/Masters/Directori

es/. (Hereafter referenced as Yahoo) in view of Wecker (US-5,806,077 10/08/98).

5.   The rejection of Claims 3-4, 10, 14-15, 20, 24-25, and 31 remain under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

as being unpatentable over Yahoo Screen Pages, 10/05/1999, pp. 1-5,

http://web.archive.org/web/19991005031700/http://dir.yahoo.com/Arts/Artists/Masters/Directori

es/. (Hereafter referenced as Yahoo) in view of Privacy Compliance Resources, "Cookies,"

02/10/01, pp. 1,

http://web.archive.org/web/20010210192514/http://www.idcide.com/pages/res_term.htm.

6.   The rejection of Claims 35, 43, and 51 remain under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Yahoo Screen Pages, 10/05/1999, pp. 1-5,

http://web.archive.org/web/19991005031700/http://dir.yahoo.com/Arts/Artists/Masters/Directori

es/. (Hereafter referenced as Yahoo) in view of Privacy Compliance Resources, "Cookies,"

02/10/01, pp. 1,

http://web.archive.org/web/20010210192514/http://www.idcide.com/pages/res_term.htm, further

in view of Wecker (US-5,806,077 10/08/98).

7.   Claims 1-4, 7-15, 17-25, 28-35, 37-43, 45-51, and 53-58 are pending in the case. Claims

1, 12, 22, 33, 41, 49, and 57-58 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on
> sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

9.   Claims 1-2, 7-9, 11-13, 17-19, 21-23, 28-30, 32, and 57 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yahoo Screen Pages, 10/05/1999, pp. 1-5,

http://web.archive.org/web/19991005031700/http://dir.yahoo.com/Arts/Artists/Masters/Directori

es/. (Hereafter referenced as Yahoo).

      -In regard to independent claims 1, 12, 22, and 57, Yahoo teaches:

      a web server (Yahoo web server);

      a web browser associated with the client (pp. 1-5, rendered by user's browser);

      wherein the Yahoo web server embeds a breadcrumbing engine (i.e. embeds the

breadcrumbing trail dependent on previous traversals) into each web page before each web page

was downloaded to the browser (pp. 1-5), where the breadcrumbing engine executed by said web

browser performs the steps:

generating a breadcrumb (pp. 2-5: "Home", "Arts", "Artists", "Masters", "Directories")

for each web page downloaded to a web browser (each page, 1-5, represent a downloaded web

page in succession from the previous page) associated with the client (user) from a web server

(Yahoo web server) associated with the Website (yahoo.com), the breadcrumbs including

navigation information (Title & URL Link) for each downloaded web page downloaded by a

user;

storing breadcrumbs associated with web pages downloaded to the web browser at the

client (i.e. downloaded web pages and breadcrumbs are stored in user's computer Internet temp

file or cache);

updating, at said client, the stored breadcrumbs (pp. 3: "Home> Arts >") with the

generated breadcrumb (pp. 4: "Home > Arts > Artists >") to form a breadcrumb navigation trail

(pp. 5: "Home > Arts > Artists > Masters >) of breadcrumbs associated with navigation of the

web.

-In regard to dependent claims 2, 13, and 23, Yahoo teaches where the navigation info

includes a title (pp. 3: "Home > Arts >) and a URL (pp. 3: Selectable URLs "Home" and "Arts")

for each downloaded web page.

-In regard to dependent claims 7, 17, and 28, Yahoo teaches determining whether the

breadcrumb for each downloaded web page was already stored at the client (e.g. clicking from

pp. 5 "<u>Arts</u>" which was a breadcrumb already stored from the traversal from the home page

which results in removing the "<u>Arts</u>" breadcrumb and all subsequent breadcrumbs ("<u>Artists</u>" and

"<u>Masters</u>") in the navigation trail).

-In regard to dependent claims 8, 18, and 29, Yahoo teaches removing the breadcrumb

and subsequent breadcrumbs from the stored breadcrumbs if the breadcrumb was determined to

be stored at the client (i.e. clicking from pp. 5 "<u>Arts</u>" which was a breadcrumb already stored

from the traversal from the home page and removing the "<u>Arts</u>" breadcrumb and all subsequent

breadcrumbs ("<u>Artists</u>" and "<u>Masters</u>") in the navigation trail).

-In regard to dependent claims 9, 19, and 30, Yahoo teaches appending the breadcrumb

(pp. 3: "Artists") to existing breadcrumbs (pp. 2: "<u>Home</u>" and "Arts") stored at he client to form

the breadcrumb navigation trail (pp. 3) if the breadcrumb was not already stored at the client.

-In regard to dependent claims 11, 21, and 32, Yahoo teaches iterating thru the breadcrumbs in

the breadcrumb navigation trail (pp. 5); and displaying a last breadcrumb (pp. 5: "Directories")

in the breadcrumb trail (pp. 5: "<u>Home</u> > <u>Arts</u> > <u>Artists</u> > <u>Masters</u> >") as plain HTML and

displaying preceding breadcrumbs as HTML links (pp. 5: "<u>Home</u> > <u>Arts</u> > <u>Artists</u> > <u>Masters</u> >")

to the corresponding web pages.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

11.   Claims 33-34, 37-42, 45-50, 53-56, and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Yahoo Screen Pages, 10/05/1999, pp. 1-5,

http://web.archive.org/web/19991005031700/http://dir.yahoo.com/Arts/Artists/Masters/Directori

es/. (Hereafter referenced as Yahoo) in view of Wecker (US-5,806,077 10/08/98).

        -In regard to independent claims 33, 41, 49, and 58, Yahoo teaches:

        a web server (Yahoo web server);

        a web browser associated with the client (pp. 1-5, rendered by user's browser);

        wherein the Yahoo web server embeds a breadcrumbing engine (i.e. embeds the

breadcrumbing trail dependent on previous traversals) into each web page before each web page

was downloaded to the browser (pp. 1-5), where the breadcrumbing engine performs the steps:

        generating a breadcrumb (pp. 2-5: "Home", "Arts", "Artists", "Masters", "Directories")

for each web page downloaded to a web browser (each page, 1-5, represent a downloaded web

page in succession from the previous page) associated with a client (user) from a web server

(Yahoo web server) associated with the Website (yahoo.com), the breadcrumbs including

navigation information (Title & URL Link) for each downloaded web page;

storing breadcrumbs associated with web pages downloaded to the web browser at the

client (i.e. downloaded web pages and breadcrumbs are stored in user's computer Internet temp

file or cache);

updating the stored breadcrumbs (pp. 3: "Home> Arts >") with the generated breadcrumb

(pp. 4: "Home > Arts > Artists >") to form a breadcrumb navigation trail (pp. 5: "Home > Arts >

Artists > Masters >) of breadcrumbs associated with navigation of the web.

Yahoo does not teach setting a time stamp corresponding to the breadcrumb navigation

trail and storing it at the client, determining whether a time interval between the time stamp and

the time a newly downloaded web page was received exceeds a threshold, and displaying the

navigation trail on the downloaded web page if the time interval exceeds the threshold.

Wecker teaches setting a time stamp corresponding to breadcrumb navigation trail

(footprint time stamp of each visited link)(column 1, lines 64-67) and storing it at the client

(column 4, lines 42-43)(Fig. 1: 10), determining a time interval between the time stamp (Fig. 3:

"Last Visit") and the newly downloaded web page (column 1, lines 66-67) to see if it exceeds a

threshold (column 4, lines 54-63), and displaying a navigation trail on the downloaded web page

(i.e. footprints or marker: Fig. 2: 26) if the time interval exceeds the threshold (column 5, lines 1-

3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for

Yahoo to have saved a time stamp and computed a time interval and threshold as shown in

Wrecker, because Wrecker teaches by doing so the user was given more control via a prompt to

edit the navigation trail to their personal preferences (column 4, lines 54-58 & 63-66)(Fig. 3).

-In regard to dependent claims 34, 42, and 50, Yahoo teaches where the navigation info includes a title (pp. 3: "Home > Arts >) and a URL (pp. 3: Selectable URLs "Home" and "Arts") for each downloaded web page.

-In regard to dependent claims 36, 44, and 52, Yahoo teaches wherein the Yahoo web server embeds a breadcrumbing engine (i.e. embeds the breadcrumbing trail dependent on previous traversals) into each web page before each web page was downloaded to the browser (pp. 1-5), where the breadcrumbing engine performs the steps (a)-(e).

-In regard to dependent claims 37, 45, and 53, Yahoo does not teach defining the threshold within the breadcrumbing engine of each downloaded web page. As discussed above in the rejection of the independent claims 33, 41, 49, and 58, Wrecker teaches establishing a time based threshold (column 4, lines 54-63) to help manage the user display.

-In regard to dependent claims 38, 46, and 54, Wecker teaches prompting a user (Fig. 3) regarding whether the user would like to resume navigation according to the breadcrumb navigation trail (column 4, lines 54-58), to help the user better manage the user display.

-In regard to dependent claims 39, 47, and 55, Wrecker teaches if the user chooses to resume navigation according to the trail (i.e. the user decides not the "Clear" the trail)(column 4, lines 54-58), the method further sets the time stamp associated with the breadcrumb navigation trail to the time associated with the downloading of the web page (i.e. a time stamp would be stored for the resumption of the trail and be saved to a file (Fig. 1: 10) as the "Last Visit" date)

(Fig: 3) according to navigation information of a last breadcrumb in the breadcrumb navigation trail (column 4, lines 32-41) and storing the time stamp at the client (column 4, lines 42-43).

-In regard to dependent claims 40, 48, and 56, Wrecker teaches if the user chooses not to resume navigation according to the trail (i.e. the user decides to "Clear" the trail)(column 4, lines 54-58), the method deletes all breadcrumbs stored at the client (column 4, lines 55-58) and storing a breadcrumb generated for the subsequent downloaded web page at the client (column 4, lines 42-43) to form a new breadcrumb navigation trail (i.e. the subsequent "first visit" time would be stored)(column 4, lines 36-38);

setting the time stamp to the time associated with the subsequent downloaded web page and storing the time stamp at the client (column 4, lines 36-41)(Fig. 1: 10); and

displaying the new breadcrumb navigation trail on the subsequent downloaded web page (Fig. 2: 26).

12.　　Claims 3-4, 10, 14-15, 20, 24-25, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yahoo Screen Pages, 10/05/1999, pp. 1-5, http://web.archive.org/web/19991005031700/http://dir.yahoo.com/Arts/Artists/Masters/Directories/. (Hereafter referenced as Yahoo) in view of Privacy Compliance Resources, "Cookies," 02/10/01, pp. 1, http://web.archive.org/web/20010210192514/http://www.idcide.com/pages/res_term.htm.

-In regard to dependent claims 3, 14, and 24, Yahoo does not teach creating a client-side

cookie for storing the breadcrumbs associated with web pages downloaded to the web browser.

Privacy Compliance Resources teaches that cookies were small text files that Web sites place in

your computer. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention for Yahoo to store the breadcrumbs as client-side cookies, because Privacy

Compliance Resources teaches that cookies help user browsers remember specific information

and remind users what they had already traversed on the web, which would have allowed the

users of Yahoo to go back to a given page and see a quick reference to the path of interest they

had followed to get there.

-In regard to dependent claims 4, 15, and 25, Yahoo teaches providing the title (pp. 3:

"Artists") associated with each downloaded web page within each downloaded web page (pp. 3).

-In regard to dependent claims 10, 20, and 31, Yahoo does not teach determining whether

the client has a client-side cookie and creating the client-side cookie if the client does not have it;

and setting a breadcrumb generated for a downloaded web page into the client side cookie. As

discussed above in the rejection of claims 3, 14, 24, 35, 43, and 51, Privacy Compliance

Resources teaches that cookies were small text files that Web sites place in your computer. It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Yahoo

to store the breadcrumbs as client-side cookies, because Privacy Compliance Resources teaches

that cookies help user browsers remember specific information and remind users what they had

already traversed on the web, which would have allowed the users of Yahoo to go back to a

given page and see a quick reference to the path of interest they had followed to get there.

13.   Claims 35, 43, and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Yahoo Screen Pages, 10/05/1999, pp. 1-5,

http://web.archive.org/web/19991005031700/http://dir.yahoo.com/Arts/Artists/Masters/Directori

es/. (Hereafter referenced as Yahoo) in view of Privacy Compliance Resources, "Cookies,"

02/10/01, pp. 1,

http://web.archive.org/web/20010210192514/http://www.idcide.com/pages/res_term.htm, further

in view of Wecker (US-5,806,077 10/08/98).

        -In regard to dependent claims 35, 43, and 51, Yahoo does not teach creating a client-side

cookie for storing the breadcrumbs associated with web pages downloaded to the web browser.

Privacy Compliance Resources teaches that cookies were small text files that Web sites place in

your computer. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention for Yahoo to store the breadcrumbs as client-side cookies, because Privacy

Compliance Resources teaches that cookies help user browsers remember specific information

and remind users what they had already traversed on the web, which would have allowed the

users of Yahoo to go back to a given page and see a quick reference to the path of interest they

had followed to get there.

        Yahoo further does not teach storing a time stamp in the cookie. Wrecker teaches storing

a breadcrumb time stamp local to the client (column 3, lines 38-44)(Fig. 1: 10). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Yahoo to have

stored a time stamp in the client side cookie, because Wrecker teaches storing a breadcrumb time stamp could be used to determine the last and first user visits to a downloaded web page (column 4, lines 36-41 & 58-67).

Response to Arguments

14.   Applicant's arguments filed 03/17/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

-In regard to independent claims 1, 12, 22, and 57, Applicant argues that the Yahoo reference does not teach or suggest a breadcrumbing solution being performed entirely on the client side wherein the solution includes a breadcrumbing engine that is embedded in the web page. The examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant and believes that the Yahoo reference does indeed teach these limitations. The Examiner wishes to first point out wherein the limitations of "all the work of collecting the breadcrumbs on the client side such that no work has to be done to collect, store, or send the breadcrumb information on the server side" (Remarks: Page 16: Lines 4-6) are not limitations of the claimed invention. In fact all the work being done on the client side is predicated on the web server embedding said breadcrumbing engine to perform the above mentioned limitations. Secondly, the Examiner wishes to point out that the terms "breadcrumbing engine" and "generating" have been broadly interpreted. The claimed "breadcrumbing engine" could be a executable (javascript) engine as suggest by Applicant (Remarks: Page 19: Lines 4-5) or it could merely coded (HTML) navigation trail embedded in the web page to be downloaded by the client, wherein the breadcrumbs are "generated" when the browser renders the code to display the navigation trail to the user on the

client side. The Examiner believes further clarification of these two elements would most likely

overcome the Yahoo reference.

With regard to (Remarks: Page 17: Lines 5-12) the Examiner believes while claims as

written may not rely on the breadcrumbs being downloaded from the server they certainly do not

preclude them from being downloaded from the server. Please note the above paragraph to the

weight given the limitation "generating a breadcrumb."

-In regard to independent claims 33, 41, 49, and 58, Applicant argues that Yahoo and

Wecker references fail to teach dynamic client-side breadcrumbing wherein each of the web

pages having a breadcrumbing engine embedded therein by the web server that performs all

aspects of dynamic client-side breadcrumbing. Please reference the above paragraphs with

regards to these limitations being met by the Yahoo reference.

Applicant also argues that reliance on the Wecker reference is misplaced in that is not

concerned about breadcrumbing and relates to display information (date and time) for the user

regarding how often the user visited the node in the past. The Examiner respectfully disagrees

and believes the combination of the Yahoo and Wecker references are both proper and meet the

limitations of the claims. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to

combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by

combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where

there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references

themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re*

Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21

USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Wecker teaches the benefits of giving a user more

control via a prompt to edit the navigation trail to meet their personal preferences (column 4, lines 54-58 & 63-66)(Fig. 3). Wecker also teaches wherein the use of time stamps provide the benefit of additionally helping the readers recognize information they have already seen without having to wonder if they actually have seen it before (column 2, lines 2-4). Again, nothing in the claim language requires breadcrumbing for a single website navigation session (Remarks: Page 18: Lines 15-17) and while the example shown in Fig. 3 of Wecker suggests different web sessions nothing in the Wecker reference precludes maintaining time stamped breadcrumbs for a single user session over a shorter period of time (i.e. a few days or shorter)(column 5, lines 1-6).

-In regard to dependent claims 3-4, 10, 14-15, 20, 24-25, and 31, Applicant argues the reliance on the "Cookies" reference is misplaced and that it does not cure the supposed deficiencies of the "Yahoo" or Wecker references as discussed above (i.e. "Cookies" does not provide a system for "dynamic client-side generation of breadcrumbs that are completely performed at the client by an executable (javascript) engine"). Please not the above paragraphs in regards to how the "Yahoo" and Wecker references are believed to meet these limitations.

The Examiner wishes to finally point out that the benefits of client versus server side processing for most Web applications are notoriously well known in the art. Such advantages to client-side processing included reducing the processing load at the server or performing customizations based on the current conditions of the client where the current conditions may change often, which would include time based user selection of web pages.

Conclusion

15.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

16.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

US-6,412,008	06-2002	Fields et al.
US-6,886,034	04-2005	Blumberg, Robert

17.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Adam L Basehoar whose telephone number is (571)-272-4121.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 7:00am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ALB

STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER